filed, and no new matter is deemed to be added. In particular, main method Claims 21 and 35 were amended to define that:

(a) each molecule is a software entity in a software logic web deployed in a remote computing environment and autonomously generates the micro-components forming the molecule;

(b) each (first) molecule invokes a next (successive) molecule to build the logic web "on the fly" in the remote computing environment;

(c) at least one of the molecules is enabled to receive a communication signal from an external communication source, so as to guide the generation of itself or another molecule in response to an external signal, thereby allowing the logic web to be extended in the remote computing environment in response, at least in part, to the external communication signal.

In contrast to the invention as defined in the main Claims 21 and 35, the Huckins patent discloses a distributed service architecture for sharing a software application among one or more remote machines. Each machine must have a copy of the same defined application running on that machine (col. 4, lines 4-7). In order for each machine to invoke a function of the shared application on another machine, the local machine must invoke an instance of that function on its own local machine (col. 8, lines 51-55) and use the local machine RI server to generate an encapsulated Protocol Data Unit (PDU) for the function which is then multicast to the remote machine (generally, col. 3, lines 14-31, and also the step logic of Fig. 5). When the remote machine receives the PDU, it uses its own remote machine RI server (col. 9, lines 6-9) to invoke the "called" function on the remote machine (col. 8, lines 11-18). The two machines can then "share" the called function of the same application since both now have invoked the same function for that application.

The invention as defined in the main Claims 21 and 35 is clearly different from the Huckins disclosure in any one or more of the following ways:

1. Each molecule is a separate software entity of a logic web generated "on the fly" on any given machine, and is not a function of the same shared application running on another machine as described in the Huckins patent.

2. Each molecule generates its own component functions locally (autonomously), not by receiving a PDU packet for a function of a shared application mirrored on another machine as in Huckins.

3. At least one of the molecules of a logic web on a given machine is responsive to an external communication signal to guide the generation of itself or another molecule, which is something that Huckins does not disclose or suggest.

The Examiner cites the Huckins patent as teaching "on the fly" communication of data from a software application running on a central computer to a remote instance of the same software program running on a remote computer. In contrast, the Applicants' amended claims define "on the fly" building of incremental phases (molecules) of a software program on a remote machine in response to signals from a command computer. The claim terminology clearer recites this structural difference in terms that "said first molecule thereupon invokes a next subsequent molecule for implementing a next selected data processing method in the remote computing environment, and similarly for subsequent molecules". The Examiner is believed to be in error for not according substantive effect to this claim terminology defining a core difference of the present invention over Huckins.

In the invention, different logic webs can be deployed in different remote computing environments. Each logic web is built from a first molecule which invokes a next molecule and so on in order to extend the logic web in that local environment "on the fly", without limitation as to what is happening on other machines. Further, the extension of the logic web can be guided in response to receiving an external communication signal. Thus, each logic web can build its own different application autonomously on each local machine, then change or modify its deployment in response to an external signal. It is not limited to a single shared application that must be run across all machines, as is true in the Huckins system where all machines must run the same shared application and invoke shared functions by generating them locally, packaging them in PDU messages, and multi-casting the PDU messages to the other machines.

In summary, Claims 21-40 as previously amended are deemed to be patentably distinct over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance, and it is requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued upon reconsideration.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing is being mailed on April 25, 2006, by depositing it in an envelope with the U.S. Postal Service, first class postage paid, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Respectfully submitted,
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Leighton K. Chong
USPTO Reg. No. 27,621
GODBEY GRIFFITHS REISS & CHONG
1001 Bishop Street, Pauahi Tower Suite 2300
Honolulu, HI 96813
Tel: (808) 523-8894; Fax: (808) 523-8899
HST < 6 hrs EST